DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 332 SO 014 203

AUTHOR Sutcliffe, Michael
TITLE Local Political Activism in the American City: Columbus, Ohio, 1900-1980.
PUB DATE 24 Apr 82
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers (San Antonio, TX, April 24, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Citizen Participation; Neighborhood Improvement; *Neighborhoods; Political Attitudes; Social Attitudes; Social Science Research; *Urban Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio (Cleveland)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines local political activism in Columbus, Ohio, between 1900 and 1980. There are two major parts to the paper. First, through a content analysis of a local newspaper "The Columbus Dispatch" over the past 80 years, the salient issues and context within which neighborhood activism occurs are defined. Data were obtained from "even-years" newspapers. Broad trends were discernible in both the intensity of neighborhood activism and the changing focus of the conflicts. Neighborhood activism increased dramatically during this period, with marked increases in the 1960s and 1970s. The major areas within which instances of activism were found included: rezoning (39.7%), the provision of urban services (33.4%), and conflicts over roads (19.2%). Most interesting was the shift from conflicts over the provision of services toward a concentration of neighborhood activism on those "developments" which threatened the neighborhood. In the second section, the conditions which prompted these changes in neighborhood activism are described. The first condition is the "commodification" of the neighborhood. The neighborhood is seen as a commodity, characterized by certain objective properties such as public safety or certain types of people and answering to certain needs. If these needs are not satisfied, residents relocate or remain in the neighborhood and control through a coalition with others the character of new residents and land developments. The second condition is the purification of the living place. For example, in an effort to keep out those lower in social status, many neighborhood activist groups fought for zoning ordinances. The result is the purified neighborhood. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M.O. Sutcliffe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LOCAL POLITICAL ACTIVISM IN THE AMERICAN CITY: COLUMBUS, OHIO, 1900-1980*

Michael Sutcliffe

The Ohio State University

> "We have more people around us, but fewer people near us. We live in a community where everything is done for us, yet you and I hardly know each other."

In delivering these remarks to a Columbus Town Meeting on November 21, 1955, Rabbi Zelizer encapsulated important aspects of the privatized world in which increasing numbers of people live in advanced capitalism: a world in which we relate to each other contingently. This paper takes as its starting point the emergence of these privatized worlds and it attempts to understand the basis of political activism organized around the living place. In particular we are concerned with those attempts by individuals or coalitions to attract, redirect, or avoid land uses and services which might be introduced into their neighborhood.

Traditionally, the documentation and analysis of coalition politics has been particularistic, seeing coalitions as merely the means whereby deficiencies of formal political channels may be overcome. This paper adopts a more critical perspective, arguing that analyses of these political behaviors need to be holistic and situated within the changing social relations and material conditions of advanced capitalist society. Through a content analysis of a local newspaper--The Columbus Dispatch--over the past eighty

SO 014 203

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers (San Antonio, TX, April 24, 1982).

years, the salient issues and context within which neighborhood activism occurs are defined. This comprises much of the first section. In the second section the conditions under which neighborhood activism emerges--commodification and purification of the living place--are described.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTIVISM IN COLUMBUS, OHIO: 1900-1980

A local newspaper--The Columbus Dispatch--provided the basis for the identification of neighborhood activism in Columbus over the past eighty years. In order to obtain a reasonably reliable data set, "even-years" newspapers were read and instances of neighborhood activism recorded. While coverage of such conflicts varies from year to year,[1] broad trends are discernible in both the intensity of neighborhood activism and the changing focus of the conflicts over the eighty-year period.

Changes in the Intensity of Neighborhood Activism

Over the eighty-year period, 614 separate controversies over the built environment were identified (Table 1). Significantly, neighborhood activism has increased dramatically during this period, especially since the Second World War[2] (Table 2). The marked increase during the 1960s and 1970s far exceeds that which would be expected on the basis of Columbus' population increase. For example, prior to the 1960s observed neighborhood activism was less than expected given the population of the Columbus metropolitan area: there were, in fact, only half as many protests as one would expect. In the 1960s and 1970s, however, observed levels of neighborhood activism exceeded by about 40% what we would expect. This is all the more significant when one realizes that the Columbus metropolitan population increased substantially from about 470,000 in 1950 to over 900,000 in 1970.

Table 1: Instances of Localized Conflict over the Built Environment: Columbus, Ohio: 1900-1980

Year	High Density Residential Rezoning	Non-Residential Rezoning	Roads	Annexation	Urban Renewal	Services	N
1970-8	38.3% (66)*	25.0 (43)	16.3 (28)	5.8 (10)	5.2 (9)	9.3 (16)	172
60-8	32.2 (48)	26.8 (40)	12.1 (18)	6.0 (9)	4.0 (6)	18.8 (28)	149
50-8	8.6 (5)	29.3 (17)	25.9 (15)	5.2 (3)	---	31.0 (18)	58
40-8	10.0 (2)	10.0 (2)	25.0 (5)	5.0 (1)	---	50.0 (10)	20
30-8	3.6 (3)	12.0 (10)	19.3 (16)	---	---	65.1 (54)	83
20-8	3.0 (2)	1.5 (1)	26.9 (18)	4.5 (3)	---	64.2 (43)	67
10-8	---	10.0 (3)	20.0 (6)	6.7 (2)	---	63.3 (19)	30
00-8	---	5.7 (2)	34.3 (12)	11.4 (4)	---	48.6 (17)	35
	20.5 (126)	19.2 (118)	19.2 (118)	5.2 (32)	2.4 (15)	33.4 (20)	614

* Row percentages are given, with the figure in parentheses referring to the number of distinct cases of political activism recorded for the even years, within each category.

Table 2: Expected and Observed Neighborhood Activism*

Decade	Expected % (based on metropolitan population)	Observed % (excluding activism over services)
1970s	29.8	38.9
1960s	23.4	32.1
1950s	16.0	10.7
1940s	11.0	2.8
1930s	9.3	5.9
1920s	7.7	3.6
1910s	5.4	2.5
1900s	3.6	3.6

* Only protests were included in the compilation of this table.

Changes in the intensity of neighborhood activism are most explicit when one examines the specific issues. Here, rising activism over downward rezoning and declining activism over the provision of services are quantitatively significant changes.

Changing Focus of the Conflicts

"Downward" rezoning (39.7%), the provision of urban services (33.4%), and conflicts over roads (19.2%) comprise the major areas within which we find instances of activism. More interesting, though, is the increasing focus on rezoning, away from an earlier orientation towards conflicts over the provision of services. This shift from conflicts over the provision of services towards a concentration of neighborhood activism on those "developments" which threaten, what Scott (1980) calls the socialization and reproduction functions of urban neighborhoods, will be examined in more detail.

Neighborhood Activism over the Provision of Services

Prior to 1950, activism with respect to the provision of services largely assumed the form of petitioning for improvements--better roads, mass transit, street cleaning, sewage provision, fire stations, street lights, and so on. The provision of these services, however, was dependent on the siting of certain centralized facilities--sewage works, streetcar termini, fire stations, municipal light plants, garbage dumps, etc. Residents, while desiring the services, opposed the location of centralized facilities within their immediate neighborhood. This opposition has increased in intensity since the 1950s, especially given the more concentrated, and thus threatening, form assumed by these facilities.

Environmental and Cultural Basis of Neighborhood Activism

Scott suggested that urban neighborhoods function as foci of socialization and reproduction in three quite distinct senses:

(1) they help to underpin the rearing and nurturing of children in socially functional ways;

(2) they facilitate the development of active networks of social and ideological relationships among groups of individuals with similar life experiences and life expectations; and

(3) they signal and in turn partly determine a particular level of social status. (Scott, 1980: 125)

In Columbus we find the vast majority of neighborhood activism organized around threats to these functions of urban neighborhoods.[3] In particular, individuals (acting individually or collectively) react to those developments which threaten the cultural or environmental character of their neighborhood.

Culturally, a variety of issues were recognized by activists as threatening the socialization and reproduction of the next generation of labor power: overcrowding of schools, introduction of pinball arcades, sale of liquor, drug treatment centers, group homes, half-way houses, and so on. We also find activists opposing facilities which undermined the "moral fabric" of the neighborhood, and hence the reproduction of the present generation of labor power. Examples in Columbus include banning harness tracks and liquor facilities.

Many other instances of activism argued against what may be broadly defined as "growth." We find activists opposing sidewalks (because they were proud of their "back to nature" neighborhood), overhead cables ("aesthetically

ugly"), sporting facilities in public parks ("destroyed pastoral community"), assessments for public services ("destroy the road's country lane atmosphere"), freeways, and so on. The peculiarly environmental character of these conflicts suggests the importance of an unalienated (albeit packaged and commodified) relationship to nature, to the reproduction of the present generation of labor power. As Harvey argues:

> Hanging on to some sense of an unalienated relation to nature makes life bearable for the worker, if only because it leads to a realistic appraisal of what has been lost and what potentially can be gained. (Harvey, 1978:28-29)

Concern for safeguarding cultural and environmental values is expressed primarily in the exclusionary character of activism.[4] This exclusion is particularly evident in opposition to "downward" rezonings,[5] especially those facilitating low income residential developments, where "homeowners fear subsidized housing will bring lower property values, crime, litter, trespassing, traffic congestion, noise and overcrowded schools." Linked with this is a recent trend toward "upward" rezonings where homeowners form a coalition to redefine their neighborhood as a single-family residential area.[6] Such activism has exclusionary implications for it maintains and reinforces a fragmented city.

This shift to a more exclusionary focus is further evidenced by the increasingly controversial nature of multi-family projects in single-family residential neighborhoods (Table 3). We find, for example, only one protest per 815 building permits in the 1920s compared to one protest per 56 permits in the 1970s. And the exclusion of higher density residential developments has dominated recent neighborhood activism.

Other correlates of exclusionary activity are suggestive of the specific circumstances under which activism is likely to emerge. First, there is the

Table 3: Neighborhood Activism over Multi-Family Projects: Columbus, Ohio: 1900-1980

Year	Ratio of Protests to Projects	Multi-Family Conflicts as % of All Neighborhood Activism
1970-78	1: 56	38.3%
1960-68	1: 41	32.2%
1950-58	1:127	8.6%
1940-48	1:220	10.0%
1930-38	1:156	3.6%
1920-28	1:815	3.0%

Table 4: Suburban versus Central-City Opposition

	Neighborhood Activism			
	Suburbs		Columbus	
Year	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected
1970s	84[1] (49%)[2]	66[3]	88 (51%)	106
1960s	74 (50%)	43	75 (50%)	106
1950s	14 (24%)	14	44 (76%)	44
1940s	2 (10%)	3	18 (90%)	17
1930s	8 (10%)	16	75 (90%)	67
1920s	10 (15%)	10	57 (85%)	57
1910s	5 (16%)	4	25 (84%)	26
1900s	5 (9%)	5	30 (91%)	30

[1] Number of instances of neighborhood activism.

[2] Percentage of neighborhood activism in suburbs as opposed to Columbus.

[3] Expected number of instances of neighborhood activism based on relative share of the metropolitan population.

question of scale. The average size of multi-family developments increased from 2.68 in the 1920s to 7.77 in the 1970s. This alone would suggest a source of conflict and, indeed, the controversial developments are the more grandiose in scale (Table 5). This sheer scale of facilities planned, then, intensifies the apprehension of those in the immediate vicinity and therefore elicits antagonism.

A second point is that the use of zoning as an exclusionary mechanism is more evident in independent suburban jurisdictions where, controlling for population, much greater degrees of activism in the post-1960s period were found than in Columbus (Table 4). The surge in suburban activism since the war may well relate to that democratization of access which Scott has suggested as significant[7]:

> rapidly increasing possibilities of personal mobility for blue-collar individuals throughout the urban system . . . [threatens] . . . those communities as efficient centers for the reproduction and domestication of white-collar and managerial social fractions. (Scott, 1980:211)

COMMODIFICATION AND PURIFICATION OF THE LIVING PLACE

In the first section we noticed both a qualitative and quantitative change in neighborhood activism over the past eighty years. Quantitatively we find a marked increase in neighborhood activism. Associated with this was a qualitative change in the form of neighborhood activism: increasingly we find activism expressing social avoidance. Hunter, for example, suggests the world is no longer one of "people in community, but rather one of people against society" (Hunter, 1978:138). The emergence of this more exclusionary form of neighborhood activism becomes possible only with the commodification of the living place; and necessary given the drive towards its purification. Each will be discussed in turn.

Table 5: Multi-Family Building Permits and Size of Controversial Apartments: Columbus, Ohio: 1900-1980

Year	Multi-Family Building Permits		Size of Controversial Apartments (where avail.)
	No. of Units	Av. Project Size	
1970-78	19455	7.77	Units: 168; 70. Acres: 4.7; 499; 28; 120; 20; 28; 150; 280; 184; 67.
1960-68	11234	12.04	Units: 40; 90; 80; 10; 36; 100; 20; 83; 487; 146. Acres: 68; 58; 38; 15. Storeys: 20; 22.
1950-58	3871	9.35	Units: 10; 198; 190; 524.
1940-48	2770	4.92	Units: 60.
1930-38	719	4.64	Units: 425; 450.
1920-28	4750	2.68	Units: 354. Lots: 73.

The Commodification of the Neighborhood

Neighborhood activism implies a particular conception of the neighborhood: the neighborhood as a thing, characterized by certain "objective" properties such as public safety, certain types of people, etc., and answering to certain needs sensed as separate from those objective properties. To the extent that needs are not satisfied, a neighborhood with the desired attributes in the correct quantities can be sought elsewhere; alternatively, the correct quantities can be attained by remaining in the neighborhood and controlling through a coalition with others the character of new residents and land developments. Both of these strategies--the relocational and the coalitional--are based on a mystified view of space: space as a thing which exercises an effect on our lives and which can be adjusted to by individuals or groups--through mobility or coalitional action--but not controlled by society as a whole.

This will be recognized as one more instance of Marx's concept of the fetishism of commodities. It suggests, correctly, that spatial fetishism and hence the possibility of neighborhood activism depend upon the commodification of the neighborhood. As Cox has shown elsewhere (Cox, 1982), however, this commodification cannot be taken for granted. At least as late as the end of the nineteenth century most working class people--and most people were working class--tended still to live a world of pre-capitalist social relations; this was particularly true with respect to living place experience. People were encapsulated in highly personalized role and status relations linking them to an extended kin network. Relations were internal and concretely particular as opposed to the external and abstractly universal relations appropriate to the world of the commodity. The living place was

experienced not as a thing but as a set of social relations with specific others which could not be duplicated elsewhere by the importation onto, or expulsion of certain social types from, a neighborhood turf.

The material basis for these relationships was the severe material uncertainty typical of the phase of competitive capital. This generated a need for some form of insurance which was provided by mutual aid between the individual households making up an extended kin network. The individual, through its nuclear household, was dependent upon specific others with whom relations consequently assumed a necessary rather than contingent character. What ends all this and allows the privatization implicit in the commodity relation to assert itself is the formalization of mutual aid through the welfare state. This attenuates the severity of material insecurity and allows commodification of the neighborhood to take place. Commodification, in turn, contains a relationship to neighborhood as a thing, an external factor impinging on people's lives: this external factor can be adjusted to by relocation--or by neighborhood activism.

The Purification of the Living Place

The obvious argument with respect to the purification of the living place is that it is due to the revolution in personal mobility, particularly that associated with the use of the automobile. Thus, the automobile facilitated the elongation of journey-to-work and shopping trips: no longer was it necessary that there be a corner shop or that places of work exist cheek by jowl with places of residence. This argument is all the more persuasive in that the growth of activism, slow in the twenties and thirties but accelerating rapidly in the fifties, approximately matches the rate at which automobile ownership diffused throughout society.

Certainly the automobile was a necessary condition for the purification of the living place. It was not, however, sufficient. Rather, we would argue, the more fundamental factor generating the purifying impulse, the realization of which the automobile facilitated, was that privatization of social relations in the living place; i.e., the same process which brought about the commodification of the living place.

As indicated above, the necessity of mutual aid at the beginning of this century tied people to each other through a matrix of highly personalized, highly particularized role and status relations; the geographical localization of the extended family, moreover, tied people not only to each other but also to a particular place and physical surround. Not only was there no choice in the specific others and the specific physical surround with which one interacted; there was no concept of choice. Identity was highly particularized and linked to specific others in a specific neighborhood. To be severed from these relations produced a chronic sense of loss: it is in these terms that one can understand the solidarity and parochiality of the traditional working class community.

In the workplace, on the other hand, commodity relations constituted individuals as independent, as related to one another in a contingent, "if-the-price-is-right" manner--rather than as dependent, relating to one another in necessary, "well-he-is-my-father" type relations. In the workplace individuals were constituted as private without obligations to specific others. The formalization of mutual aid through the welfare state allows the displacement of this privatizing impulse into the reproductive sphere. No longer is the nuclear family dependent upon the extended family; no longer, therefore, is living place experience fashioned by relations of necessity

with specific others. Privatization, however, makes problematic what hitherto was not. In particular, issues of social control, status, and physical surrounding emerge and become use values which the individual senses as somehow separate from, and independent of, a preference function. The implementation of that preference function produces--inadvertently--the purified landscape.

In the traditional working class community social control is not an issue since the extended family provides an ever-present sanctioning force over the activities of the individual. Peer group interactions are easily monitored. The fear of "letting down the family name" provides an all-pervading control mechanism. Not so in the anonymous, privatized suburb. There, every other household is a potential saboteur of socialization within one's nuclear family or a potential public nuisance. To wrest control from the threat of social anarchy one seeks refuge in social stereotypes. Would-be neighbors are evaluated as threats to, or facilitators of, social control by their overt social characteristics, particularly occupation and income.

Likewise social status becomes problematic. In the traditional working class community statuses are those typically associated with pre-capitalist social structures: ones of kinship and sex. Once that community dissolves, however, these criteria lose their force as relations defining a sense of self-worth. Young and Wilmott (1957) affirm this--that material achievement replaces more personalized conceptions of status.[8] However, they conclude that material achievement emerges as the criterion of status by default. We would certainly take issue with this. It would seem to us that it emerges <u>of necessity</u> since the reproduction of capitalist production relations depends upon a value system generative of a work ethic.

However, in an anonymous, impersonal society how can the degree to which one has achieved the bourgeois ideal be conveyed to others? Material possessions such as the house, automobile, etc., are clearly important but--and more pertinent to our present argument--so is neighborhood. In residential choice, therefore, neighborhoods are evaluated according to the degree to which they will endow the resident with status. That people strongly associate socio-economic status with neighborhood has been shown elsewhere. With reference to a study of stratification in Kansas City it is concluded that "[R]esidential address was considered (by respondents) the quickest index to a family's social status--the foremost sign of the breadwinner's financial competence and his or his wife's social ambitions" (Coleman and Neugarten, 1971:30).

A third area in which privatization has implications for purification is that of the physical surround. Just as public safety, children's peer groups and social status emerge as "objective" characteristics of neighborhoods--to provide the arguments of residential preference functions--so does a certain image of the physical character of a neighborhood: an image, to be more precise, which evokes a more consummatory, less instrumental relationship with nature. Apart from a well wooded landscape, this would include street patterns which adjust to the natural contours of the land, cul-de-sacs to provide insulation from traffic noise, underground utilities, the exclusion of commercial and industrial facilities and a variety of housing styles. This is what Werthman has called a "social class aesthetic"; the term, interestingly enough, indicates the way in which status and environmental considerations merge into a single dimension of residential "purity."

This ideal, however, stands in stark contrast to the attachment which the traditional working class has often shown to what must, to bourgeois eyes,

seem the most depressing of physical environments: unrelieved streetscapes, corner shops, views of distant chimneys, shipyard gantries, and slag heaps, or atmospheres pervaded by the smell of coal tar. Indicative perhaps is the word "attachment." The traditional working class seems "attached" to its home turfs and to their physical characteristics; nobody, however, is "attached" to winding lanes and distant views of the ocean--rather they consume or experience them in a relatively detached fashion and they are evaluated according to the "objective" standards of the social class aesthetic. Again, what we seem to be encountering here is one more effect of privatization and the breakdown of traditional working class communities. It is in the context of traditional, kin-oriented working class communities that people develop "attachment": just as people are organically bound to one another through a mesh of highly personalized relations so the relation to the physical surround becomes an unquestioned presupposition of one's everyday existence.

> The physical place becomes an extension of one's ego. The outer worlds of neighborhood-based peer groups, neighborhood-based family, and the physical neighborhood place itself, seem to become internalized as inseparable aspects of one's inner perceptions of self. In the highly personalized life of the working-class neighborhood, where one's experiences are largely limited to social contacts with others who are but minutes away, the physical space and the physical buildings become reified as aspects of the social group. One's conception of himself and of his place in society is thus subtly merged with his conceptions of the spatially limited territory of limited social interaction. (Webber, 1964:63)

Just as the breakup of the traditional working class community allows bourgeois status systems to assert themselves, so too a social class aesthetic can replace parochial "attachment." Moreover, just as the adoption of bourgeois status systems is not a matter of replacement by default, neither is the adoption of the social class aesthetic. Harvey has shown

elsewhere how critical this mystified view of nature is to those embroiled in a labor process which involves an alienating relation to nature, just as much as it alienates one person from another (Harvey, 1978:26-29).

To some degree these use values can be, and are, secured through residential choice behavior. Privatization, however, places the consumption relationship continually at risk. Neighbors feel no obligation to one another with respect to the uses to which they put their land, the people they sell it to, etc. Local government, therefore, becomes an indispensable adjunct to securing the consumption relationship in the living place by forestalling the worst of the negative externalities that could prevail. Of critical--though not exclusive--significance in this regard is the zoning ordinance. By this means one can go some way towards ensuring the social class aesthetic; and also through keeping out those lower in social status one's own social status will be safeguarded along with one's own effectiveness as a socialization agent.[9] The result is the purified neighborhood.

This tendency towards the purified neighborhood is inscribed in the historical geography of the city--or certainly in that of Columbus, Ohio. Thus in order to demonstrate this, a random sample of 150 addresses in the Polk's Columbus City Directory was selected for each of four years--1920, 1940, 1960, 1980. Land uses were recorded for each of the addresses and the two "next-door" neighbors (Table 6). An examination of these "triads" of land uses provides striking evidence for this shift towards a purified neighborhood. Over the sixty-year period we find an increasing segregation in land uses. For example, the proportion of all the triads containing the same land use increased from 65% in 1920 to 91% in 1980. This is due mainly to a massive reduction in the number of commercial and multi-family dwellings found in single-family residential neighborhoods. In 1920, for example,

Table 6: Spatial Implications of Purification

Land Uses	Year 1920	1940	1960	1980
HHH	90 (60%)	90 (60%)	104 (69%)	98 (65%)
HHB	3 (2%)	4 (3%)	--	2 (1%)
HHM	34 (23%)	18 (12%)	8 (5%)	4 (3%)
BBB	7 (5%)	13 (9%)	7 (5%)	7 (5%)
BBH	77 (5%)	3 (2%)	--	--
BBM	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
MMM	--	5 (3%)	20 (13%)	31 (21%)
MMH	3 (2%)	11 (7%)	5 (3%)	3 (2%)
MMB	--	2 (1%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)
MBH	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	--	--

M - Multi-Family Dwelling

H - Single-Family Dwelling

B - Business or Industrial Use

25% of the triads contained at least two single-family residences and either a multi-family or commercial land use. This had decreased to only 4% by 1980. Associated with this purification of single-family residential neighborhoods is a marked increase in triads containing only multiple-family dwellings--from 0% in 1920 to 21% in 1980.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Three characteristics of neighborhood activism were noticed in the content analysis. First, the particular struggles were over some of the immediate interests of labor: in particular they were conflicts over the maintenance and/or improvement of living conditions. Second, the activists (individually or collectively) defined their interests as antagonistic to other fractions of labor (for example, the poor or blacks), or fractions of capital (for example, industrial capitals or property capitals). Third, the struggles were all defensive in nature: generally a response to some outside threat. This threat was generally to the environmental or cultural homogeneity of the neighborhood. These characteristics of the struggles--concern with the immediate interests of labor in the living place, their divisive nature,[10] and their defensive orientation[11]--are included under what Erik Olin Wright calls the immediate class interests of labor.[12] The struggles are attempts by labor to improve their immediate conditions of existence under capitalism. Over the past eighty years these class conflicts have increased in intensity and become more defensive and divisive. The material conditions for this change, we argued, were the increasing commodification and purification of the living place.

The commodification of the living place and the emergence of purified neighborhoods have implications far beyond the neighborhood itself, for they

reassert the contradiction between individual and society so distinctive under capitalism. The atomization of society is exemplified in the private anarchical character of capitalist production, and in the privatized nature of resistance to such production of the built environment. One result of this atomization is that solutions to the location of facilities become increasingly erratic and anarchic, providing (e.g.) sprawl here and congestion there, and imposing substantial disruption on the lives of those who had sought refuge.

This suggests a need for more social planning, yet it is exactly for this need that zoning was introduced in the 1920s and 1930s. As Scott notes: "Zoning gives property owners some assurance about the likely course of urban development" (Scott, 1980:210). However, zoning--a social outcome--continually provides a barrier to the private accumulation of capital. As property capitals try to remove these barriers through (e.g.) downward rezoning, residents form coalitions to defend their turf against the threat posed. This neighborhood activism, however, does not eliminate the problem. At best, it simply (i) shifts the problem elsewhere; (ii) results in the increasing socialization in the provision of services and facilities, and their returning in a more threatening form: or (iii) results in compromises being made which only lessen, and do not remove, the threat (e.g., single-family homes buffering shopping centers from existing single-family homes). The very fact that neighborhood activism confines itself to the immediate class interests of labor means that only an incomplete recognition of the source of the problem is attained.

FOOTNOTES

*The research on which this paper is based is supported by a grant from NSF (SES-8112324). This support is gratefully acknowledged.

[1]Over the period, marked differences were found in terms of column lines devoted to such neighborhood activism in the newspapers: differences due to the size of the Columbus Dispatch, the significance attached to such "local" events, reporter "interest," and so on. While it is feasible to use column line inches as a surrogate for examining the neighborhood activism/investment in the built environment relationship in the short term (see Cox and McCarthy, 1981) as these influences are minimized, longer term evaluations of neighborhood activism may only reliably examine changes in the nature of the issues over which residents were protesting. In order to reduce the problem of "non-reporting," rezoning files housed in the Development Department of the Columbus City Council were examined.

[2]Only protests were included in examining the intensity of neighborhood activism because of both problems in the reporting of neighborhood meetings and the decrease in petitions for urban services consequent to the introduction of a capital improvements program.

[3]Hays (1974), for example, remarked that urban development, "because it focused on community change . . . helped to reactivate . . . community impulses and met increasing opposition from them." (Hays, 1974:31).

[4]A variety of exclusionary mechanisms were used by homeowners to maintain the "continuity" of their single-family neighborhoods. Instances have the activists buying up vacant land in order to control the development process; using the referendum mechanism or courts to reverse rezoning decisions; pressuring city council to cut off services to federally funded projects; and attempting to increase land or floor area requirements.

[5]Other forms of exclusion include (i) opposition to street widenings (to control the flow of outsiders); (ii) opposition to swings in parks (to keep out other children); and (iii) the use of annexation to exclude obnoxious facilities and to provide "buffer" zones.

[6]An examination of the rezoning files provides evidence of these upward rezonings occurring on a reasonably large scale: comprising between 5% and 15% of all rezonings in the post-1940 period.

[7]In Columbus, for example, we find the suburbanization of blue-collar workers as opposed to white collar workers being essentially a post-World War II phenomenon. Examining the density gradients for both white collar workers and blue collar workers we find the ratio of the two slopes (i.e., white collar to blue collar) converging over time: the ratio being 3.68 in 1950 and only 2.39 in 1970. This convergence provides evidence, albeit limited, for this "democratization of access" thesis.

[8]Young and Wilmott suggest:

> People in Bethnal Green are less concerned with "getting on". Naturally they want to have more money and a better education for their children. The borough belongs to the same society as the estate, one in which standards and aspirations are moving upwards together. But the urge is less compulsive. They stand well with plenty of other people whether or not they have net curtains and a fine pram. Their credit with others does not depend so much on their "success" as on the subtleties of behaviour in their many face-to-face relationships. They have the security of belonging to a series of small and overlapping groups, and from their fellows they get the respect they need.
>
> How different is Greenleigh we have already seen. Where nearly everyone is a stranger, there is no means of uncovering personality. People cannot be judged by their personal characteristics: a person can certainly see that his neighbour works in his back garden in his shirt sleeves and his wife goes down to the shops in a blue coat, with two canvas bags; but that is not much of a guide to character. Judgement must therefore rest on the trappings of the man rather than on the man himself. If people have nothing else to go by, they judge from his appearance, his house, or even his Minimotor. He is evaluated accordingly. Once the accepted standards are few, and mostly to do with wealth, they become the standards by which "status" is judged. (Young and Wilmott, 1957:162)

[9]Interestingly, we find the composition of the coalitions of neighborhood activists changing over time and reflecting this drive towards purification. For example, earlier on, coalitions of local businessmen and homeowners were very common; however, with the increasing socialization of businesses and their removal from residential neighborhoods, the coalitions became almost exclusively homeowners.

[10]The "divisive" aspect of neighborhood activism is evidenced at a variety of spatial scales. Frequently, controversies emerge over an "unfair" allocation of services/facilities to certain neighborhoods. For example, in 1900 we find "north side people . . . have fine streets and aqueducts and if the expenditure does not stop in that section of the city, the north side will become a set of royal paupers at the expense of the other sections of the city." In 1974 one finds similar arguments being used to obtain facilities on the north side where residents argued they did not receive a fair allocation of sidewalks, paths, bikepaths, trees, etc.

Often one finds central-city-suburban conflicts. Many instances may be cited where central city residents feel they are subsidizing the suburban utilities.

[11]Interestingly this defensive aspect of living place struggles mirrors similar immediate class struggles in the workplace. For example, Walkowitz argued that "working class violence, rather than being directed at the manufacturer, was directed at the ranks of the unemployed ready to claim their jobs" (Walkowitz, 1972:465). And Katz shows the petit-bourgeoisie display similar

reactions: "uneasy men scrambling for success amidst the constant threat and the frequent reality of failure" (Katz, 1975:23).

[12] "Immediate class interests are defined within a given mode of production . . . and defined largely by market relations. Struggles for wages, better living conditions, better educational opportunities and so forth all constitute struggles for objectives defined within the basic structure of capitalism. . . . Immediate interests are not 'false' interests; they are 'incomplete' interests. The struggle over wages reflects a correct understanding by workers of their immediate conditions within capitalism; the restriction of struggles to questions of wages, however, reflects an incomplete understanding of capitalist society as a whole, for it fails to grasp the possibility of transcending the entire system of capitalist exploitation through socialism. [Fundamental class interests, on the other hand] challenge the premises of the dominant mode of production, and consequently have revolutionary implications." (Wright, 1978:90)

REFERENCES

Coleman, R.P., and Neugarten, B.L. (1971). Social status in the city. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Cox, K.R. (1982). The commodification of the neighborhood. Paper presented to the Association of American Geographers, Annual Meetings, San Antonio.

Harvey, D. (1978). Labor, capital and class struggle around the built environment. In Urbanization and conflict in market societies. (K. R. Cox, ed.), ch. 1. Chicago: Maaroufa.

Hays, S.P. (1974). The changing political structure of the city in industrial America. Journal of Urban History 1(1), 6-38.

Hunter, A. (1978). Persistence of local sentiments in mass society. In Handbook of contemporary life. (D. Street, et al., eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, M. (1975). The entrepreneurial class in a Canadian city. Journal of Social History, 8, 1-29.

Scott, A.J. (1980). The urban land nexus and the state. London: Pion.

Walkowitz, D.L. (1972). Working-class women in the gilded age: Factory, community and family life among Cohoes, New York cotton workers. Journal of Social History 5(4), 464-490.

Webber, M. (1964). Culture, territoriality and the elastic mile. Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association 13, 59-69.

Wright, E.O. (1978). Class, crisis and the state. London: New Left Books.

Young, M., and Wilmott, P. (1957). Family and kinship in East London. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.